

**REMARKS**

Claims 11-13 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 11-13 are amended. Support for the amendment to claim 11 can be found in the specification, for example, at page 19, line 27 - page 20, line 3, and in Fig. 19. Claims 12 and 13 are amended to be consistent with amended claim 11. No new matter is added.

The Office Action rejects claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,603,506 to Ogawa et al. (hereinafter Ogawa), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,649,032 to Burt et al. (hereinafter Burt). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that Ogawa and Burt, either alone, or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a display that displays printing information which shows that the plurality of image data selected by the selector are printed so as to entirely superimpose a plurality of frames and record the plurality of frames as one image, as recited in independent claim 11.

The Office Action alleges that Ogawa's sensing apparatus 10 includes a display device in the user I/F parts group 10i of Ogawa that corresponds to the claimed display. The Office Action, citing Fig. 5 of Ogawa, also alleges that Ogawa discloses printing a plurality of images on one sheet. The Office Action acknowledges that Ogawa fails to disclose that the display device in the user I/F parts group 10i of Ogawa displays a plurality of image data simultaneously. However, the Office Action alleges that Burt remedies the deficiencies of Ogawa. In particular, the Office Action alleges that Burt discloses simultaneously displaying multiple different images selected by a user and that the multiple different images correspond to the claimed plurality of image data. The Office Action further alleges that the combination of Ogawa and Burt render obvious the claimed display. Applicants respectfully disagree with these assertions.

Applicants submit that Burt merely discloses aligning multiple input images to form a mosaic image (see Burt, Abstract). Moreover, Burt fails to disclose or suggest that the multiple images (the alleged plurality of image data) are aligned or printed so as to entirely superimpose a plurality of frames and record the plurality of frames as one image, as recited in independent claim 13. In contrast, Burt discloses aligning images such that the multiple images merely overlap to form a mosaic image (see Burt, Figs. 2A-2C). Burt does not teach or suggest that the aligned images are entirely superimposed, as recited in claim 11.

Therefore, independent claim 11 is patentable over the combination of Ogawa and Burt. Further claims 12 and 13, which depend from independent claim 11, also are patentable over the combination of Ogawa and Burt, for at least the reasons independent claim 11 is patentable, as well as for the additional features these claims recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Burt. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to the §103(a) rejection over Ogawa and Burt, Burt fails to disclose or suggest a display that displays printing information which shows that the plurality of image data selected by the selector are printed so as to entirely superimpose a plurality of frames and record the plurality of frames as one image, as recited in independent claim 11. Thus, withdrawal of this rejection of claims 11-13 is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino  
Registration No. 33,565

Lenwood Faulcon, Jr.  
Registration No. 61,310

MAC:LXF/mld

Attachment:  
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: April 17, 2008

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--